DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 858 SO 018 890

AUTHOR Barringer, Sallie H.
TITLE An Examination of the Use of Lists of Recent Publications Found in Selected Journals in British and European History for Collection Development and Current Awareness by Librarians and Historians: A Master's Paper for the M.S. in L.S. Degree, July, 1985.
PUB DATE Jul 85
NOTE 46p.; M.S. Thesis, North Carolina University, Chapel Hill.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; Annotated Bibliographies; *European History; Higher Education; *Information Needs; Librarians; Library Acquisition; Library Collection Development; *Library Material Selection; *Periodicals; *Publications; Research Reports; Serials; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Duke University NC; *English History; *Historians; University of North Carolina Chapel Hill

ABSTRACT

This master's paper examines the use, by historians and librarians, of lists of recent publications, bibliographies, and reviews appearing in selected British and European history journals. Part 1 contains: (1) an introduction; (2) background information; (3) a literature review; (4) the problem statement; (5) a definition of terms; and (6) the research methodology. Part 2 describes the results of a survey conducted among historians and librarians at Duke University (North Carolina) and the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill). This survey identified those journals considered most important by historians for current awareness of new publications and the relative importance that librarians attached to these lists for document selection. Part 3 contains an annotated bibliography of selected British and European history journals that regularly contain publications lists. Each entry contains: (1) the library call number; (2) the survey score; (3) publishing information; (4) the journal's subject scope; and (5) a brief annotation. Appendices include the survey instruments and accompanying letter. (JHP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295858

AN EXAMINATION OF THE USE OF LISTS OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS FOUND IN SELECTED JOURNALS IN BRITISH AND EUROPEAN HISTORY FOR COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

by

Sallie H. Barringer

Master's Thesis

North Carolina University

Chapel Hill

30 018890

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
SALLIE H. BARRINGER
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sallie Hayman Barringer. An Examination of the Use of Lists of Recent Publications Found in Selected Journals in British and European History for Collection Development and Current Awareness by Librarians and Historians. A master's paper for the M.S. in L.S. degree, July, 1985. 46 pages. Advisor: Robert N. Broadus.

This paper is an attempt to examine the use of the lists of recent publications, bibliographies, and lists of reviews found in selected journals in British and European history by historians and librarians. There are three main parts. The first part is an introduction and general background to this problem, including a literature review. The second part is a description of surveys conducted among historians and librarians at Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. These surveys determined those journals deemed most important by historians for current awareness of new publications, and the relative importance librarians attached to such lists for selection. The third part is an annotated list of selected journals in British and European history that regularly contain lists of recent publications, book reviews, and bibliographies that are consulted by historians and that would be useful to librarians with collection development responsibilities in these areas.

HEADINGS:
COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES -- COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT
PERIODICALS -- HISTORY
BOOK SELECTION
COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES -- BOOK SELECTION

PART ONE

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper is a study of one method of collection development. It focuses on studying the dissemination of information about recent publications for scholars in a particular subject field, British and European history, and through one medium, the bibliographies and lists of recent publications found in scholarly journals and serials in this particular area. The impetus for this study came from observations made during the course of a collection analysis of Duke University's holdings in French history, as part of a Library-wide Collection Analysis Project. During this project, serial bibliographies proved to be of very great value for monitoring acquisitions patterns in this subject area over the past ten years, since they listed both major and minor publications in particular subject areas over a given span of time, allowing librarians to determine not only those individual works that the library had not acquired, but also those years in which acquisitions in particular subject areas had been low. In addition, the bibliographies provided a good guide to those works that were considered most important by historians, since they were major sources for the scholars' own current awareness of recent publication. Thus, these serial bibliographies proved to be a very effective and efficient collection development tool in this particular case, and have the potential for being useful to collection development librarians.

II. BACKGROUND

The terms collection development and collection development librarians arose in the late 1950's and 1960's to describe a separate subdiscipline of librarianship. It was a response to the growing demands of an increasingly professionalized academic community, which needed, and shortly grew to expect, libraries which were major sources for their specialized research. The university and college world was expanding in leaps and bounds, and libraries grew to meet these needs. Like the institutions of which they were part, libraries thought that anything was possible--all they needed, in the words of President Lloyd Elliott of George Washington University, was "a little more time and a lot more money."[1]

With this growth came the introduction of highly trained bibliographers and collection development specialists. For the first time, their role was distinguished from being simply one part of acquisitions. Collection development was "the premier function of librarianship," according to Keyes Metcalf, a library administrator at Harvard University.[2] In its ideal state, it was defined, then and now, as the "effective and timely selection of library materials forming carefully constructed area or subject collections, shaped over time by bibliographic experts."[3] Its problems were selection and acquisition, with an emphasis on the former. In its striving for adequacy or excellence in particular fields, it paralleled the programs of the university itself.

Yet these aims, even in the euphoric days of the early 1960's, were always hedged by available funding. Library costs and the demands placed on library collections continued to rise at the same time. Libraries wish to spend everything they get, and more, yet they must be satisfied with less and less money.

By 1979, four of the conclusions from the 1979 Report of the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication were particularly apt:

"1) Research library budgets, which in the majority of cases depend on university budgets, are unlikely to increase significantly over the next decade.

2) Neither the federal government nor private foundations are likely to provide substantial new library resources.

3) The costs of books and periodicals have risen more rapidly than other major college and university expenditures during the last decade, and seem likely to continue to do so.

4) Growing concern with the cost to the lending institution of interlibrary loans, plus the unreliability of such loans as a source of materials, means that new methods for resource sharing must be developed."[4]

Libraries are in a squeeze, caught between the high demands of scholars and the even higher cost of new materials. In the past, most collection development librarians, because of the pressures of time and other responsibilities, had been unable to follow the ideal model of collection development. Instead of carefully monitoring their libraries' acquisitions, they had to rely on just buying more and more, hoping to cover the necessary areas in this way.

The pressures of the current financial situation of most libraries has forced most collection development librarians to change this pattern, though. Instead of just allowing their collections to grow larger and larger, librarians are concentrating on analyzing what is needed by the library users. They are becoming sociologists of library behavior, studying and establishing patterns of need for and use of library materials. As they establish user profiles, they then use them to shape appropriate parts of the collection. They attempt to seek to separate the trivial from the truly necessary. In a sense, it is a new

attempt to achieve the previously mentioned ideal form of collection development. When collection development, in the true sense of the term, is effectively carried out, librarians become stewards of library materials, and not just bigger spenders and builders.[5]

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Most studies of the dissemination of information among historians agree on the importance to them of bibliographies and book reviews. Books are their most important source of information; they need and depend on reviews of these to stay abreast of new developments in their fields, since journal articles tend to touch only on very narrow facets. Few historians actively participate in the "invisible colleges" so common in the sciences. Most work as solitary researchers with very little interaction among colleagues about their own area of interest.[6]

Some research has been done by librarians about historians' information needs. In their studies, they have attempted to find the most important ways in which historians became aware of new publications, information which in turn could be very useful to collection development librarians for their decisions. Two British surveys, one, an "Investigation into Information Requirements of the Social Sciences" or INFROSS, as it has come to be known, a project at Bath University, dealing with social scientists' research methods[7], and the other, "Information Needs in the Humanities: Two Postal Surveys," a University of Sheffield study of humanists' information needs[8], both included historians, although the Bath study only included economic ones. In spite of the small number of historians included in the INFROSS study (only 28 with a primary interest in history, out of 1089 total respondents), the results are particularly significant for this paper because all the historians surveyed stressed the importance of journal bibliographies for their own information-gathering.[9] The Sheffield study surveyed 1924 scholars and Ph.D candidates in the humanities, of which 27.8 percent (534) were in History. The response rate among historians was good: 68.6 percent of the academic staff, and 85.1 percent of the Ph.D candidates returned usable forms. Of these, 499, or 93 percent,

reported that scanning journals' lists and bibliographies was very important for keeping up-to-date.[10]

In the United States, the Joint Committee on Bibliographical Services to History conducted a survey of historians' methods of dissemination of information, which produced rather limited results, mainly because of an extremely poor response from the historians surveyed. Those historians who did respond, though, listed journals as being very important for finding out about new publications.[11] A serial use study done by Patricia Stenstrom and Ruth McBride, "Serial Use by Social Science Faculty: a Survey," examined information patterns of social scientists at the University of Illinois from a slightly different perspective. The social scientists were surveyed to determine the importance of the library's collection for information gathering. It was found that they saw the library and its collection as a supplementary rather than a primary source for serials information. They were far more likely to subscribe to their most heavily used journals than to read them in the library.[12]

A recent article by Mary McPherson, a Canadian librarian, analyzes historiography, and the implications that the changes in this area have for collection development. She points out that as the field of history has expanded to include more and more areas, breaking down traditional subject barriers in the process, so have the traditional subject divisions in historical collection development been forced to break down, and with them the older methods of building library collections in history. She urges librarians to be more proactive in their collection development activities, to anticipate historians' needs. Among other things, she advocates use of scholarly journals' reviews and bibliographies.[13]

There have also been several review articles about studies of other methods of assessing social scientists' information patterns, but unfortunately they all excluded history from the academic fields surveyed.[14] History is often excluded from the social science-oriented studies because it is deemed one of the humanities; a social science.

Two citation studies of historical materials merit especial attention because of the light that their results shed on the change in the importance of scholarly journals for historical research in the last 40 years. The first, by Robert McAnally, was on American history,[15] the other by Clyve Jones, Michael Chapman, and Pamela Wood, was on English history.[16] These analyze not only what materials are used by historians, but for what they are used and how the historians find out about them.

McAnally's study is quite old, having been done in 1951. In it, he proposed to analyze the materials used in historical research to "discover the fundamental facts about the nature and extent of the use of such materials."[17] He studied the changes in the materials cited in Writings on American History between 1903, when it was first published, and 1938-40, the last issue released at the time of his writing. This bibliography, produced by the U.S. Government Printing Office and the American Historical Association, indexed all known publication in American history for the years covered. McAnally analyzed materials by 1) form and the relative importance of that form, 2) subject field, 3) class of material, i.e. primary or secondary, 4) temporal span, 5) country of origin, 6) relative importance of particular titles, and 7) the shifts in use of particular types of materials between 1903 and 1938-40.[18] The most significant results of his study, in the light of this paper, are 1) journals were relatively unimportant to historical scholars of this period, and 2) they formed a relatively small part of historical literature in the pre-war period--only

9.23 percent of the total citations analyzed by McAnally. In addition, scholarly works in history tended to have a very long period of usefulness,[19] a tendency which continues to the present day.

The Jones, Chapman, and Wood study, "The Characteristics of the Literature Used by Historians," was done more recently, in 1971. They examined over 7,000 references drawn from a sample of articles on English history, with the aim of discovering the nature of materials used. They found that the largest number of references were books; except for a few core titles, serials were not frequently cited. Relatively few foreign language titles were cited. While "secondary" works tended to become obsolete quickly, "primary" works were valuable for many years, thus putting history somewhere between the humanities and the social sciences in this respect.[20]

While some librarians have studied the ways in which historians find out about new publications in their field, and which kinds of materials are most important to them, others have focused on determining the actual works in a particular area that are considered most significant, and drawing up lists of these. Specific lists on historical subjects have been developed which assess the quality of a library's holdings in that particular area. Probably the most relevant of these to this paper is the evaluation of the Latin American Colonial history collection at the University of Chicago's Newberry Library, done by Robert P. Coale in 1964. Although it is more than 20 years old, it is a good example of a very effective way of analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of a particular segment of a large collection. Basically, Coale checked the Newberry's holdings against the bibliographies of standard texts in the particular field to determine if it would have been possible for a scholar to write these books at the Newberry. The idea was to use books that were actually consulted by scholars and not simply theoretical lists of best books. The

Newberry's holdings were then compared against the holdings of other notable Latin American collections.[21]

Another useful, although considerably older, such study was that done by Harold Lasswell and Douglas Waples in 1935. Five hundred books in the social sciences, written in French, English, and German, and deemed important by scholars in the field were selected, and the collections of Harvard, the University of Chicago, Berkeley, the University of Michigan, and the New York Public Library were checked to see if they contained these works. Among the academic libraries, holdings ranged from 63 percent at Harvard to 31 percent at Michigan, but the greatest number of these, 92 percent were held by the New York Public Library, whose collection had been assembled not by faculty, but by librarians and subject bibliographers.[22]

The most useful and relevant recent study, for the purposes of this paper, and for practical collection development in general, is Margaret Stieg's survey of information gathering by historians.[23] Her study concentrates on the types of bibliographic materials used by historians, and the ways in which they use them. It also provides a good survey of past research in this area of librarianship. The changes in the library world over the last ten years which have affected collection development in the light of the results of earlier research in this area are analyzed, especially the Jones, Chapman, and Wood study. She notes the increasing reliance of historians on scholarly journals as particularly important. Historians are more concerned than ever with having the latest publications on a particular subject, and they are depending on book review lists and lists of new publications in journals for their own current awareness in their respective fields.[24]

Thus, scholarly journals and serials play a very important role in historians' awareness of recent publications in their field. Their role has increased greatly over the past decade, and there are indications that this trend will continue, as historians attempt to find out more and more quickly about new developments in research in their subject areas.

IV. PROBLEM STATEMENT

In this study, an attempt is made to determine 1) which journals in British and European history containing lists of recent publications, book reviews, and bibliographic essays are considered especially important by historians for their own current awareness and 2) whether these lists are used by librarians for collection development, and their importance in this activity.

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS AS USED IN THIS PAPER

LIST OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS - A list or bibliography which appears as a regular feature in a scholarly journal which lists and/or reviews books, bibliographies, new journals, etc. whcih have recently appeared in that subject field.

HISTORICAL SCHOLARS - Teachers of history at the university or college level, and graduate students in history actively engaged in their studies.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT - Planning, selection, and acquisition of materials to form a library's main collection or special subject collections, with the ultimate goal of completeness of the library's collection. It also includes determining which of the library's materials are to be preserved, stored in a remote location, or discarded.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT LIBRARIANS - Librarians who have the responsiblility for collection development by their respective libraries in at least one area, either full- or part-time.

COLLECTION EVALUATION - Evaluation of a library collection's completeness or adequacy, based on user surveys, comparisons with standard lists of recommended essential works, or some other method.

VI. METHODOLOGY

An attempt was made to identify a core group of historical journals in British and European history that contained substantial lists of recent publications used by collection development librarians. The faculty and doctoral students in British and European history at UNC-CH and Duke Universities were sent surveys requesting information. Librarians involved in collection development at UNC-CH and Duke were also sent surveys to determine what their current sources were for finding out about new publications in the field for which they were responsible, and what they thought about using the lists of recent publications found in serials for collection development.

PART TWO

SURVEY RESULTS

I. SURVEY OF HISTORIANS

In order to determine which historical journals were considered most important by scholars for their own current awareness of new publications in their fields, the faculty and doctoral students in British and European history at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Duke University were sent questionnaires in late February, 1985 (See Appendices I and II). This survey had been preceded by a pilot survey in mid-January, 1985, in which questionnaires had been sent to 11 of the history faculty at Duke and Chapel Hill. In that survey, the cover letters had specifically asked for any suggestions about improving the format or content of the survey form. Nine responses were received, several of which recommended changes in these areas. Two changes were incorporated into the questionnaire on the basis of these suggestions, namely that: 1) the respondents were asked to rank the journals in their order of relative importance, and 2) the questionnaire itself was compressed onto one page. For the final survey, 100 questionnaires were sent to graduate students; 28 were sent to faculty.

The results of this survey were, to say the least, disappointing, particularly the response from graduate students. Of the 58 surveys sent to graduate students at Duke, there were only 19 responses and, of these, only 13 were from students in the subject areas of the journals in the list on the form.

To the 42 surveys sent to students at UNC-CH, there were only 15 responses, of which only seven were useful because of the reasons mentioned previously. There are two possible reasons for this low rate of response. The first of these was the impossibility of pinpointing exactly what the fields of the individual doctoral students were. At UNC-CH, some help was given by the Departmental secretary and various students in the department; however, no such assistance was possible at Duke because of a departmental policy of not making such information public. Surveys had simply had to be sent to all the students in the department, and the consequence was the number of responses that were not useful. The other reason that the response may have been so low, at least from UNC-CH, is that directly before this survey went out, another very long and (evidently) poorly written survey from another department was given to all history graduate students. This was found out later, from several students in the department, who said that many of their peers were so disgusted with surveys in general that they were simply throwing away any more that appeared in their boxes without even looking at them.

Response from history faculty was better. It was possible to determine exactly to whom the survey should go, and this to get a better return. There were six, out of a possible eight, responses from Duke University, and 14 out of 20 from UNC-CH.

In any case, such a poor rate of response prevents drawing any definite conclusions from the results of this survey. Only some indications of general trends can be determined. The graduate students, who had received their B.A.'s on an average of five to six years ago, and anticipated receiving their doctorates within the next two years, tended to read only two or three journals very seriously. The clear favorite was the American Historical Review. No other journal was as popular as this one, although the British Historical Review

and Central European History were also listed as very popular. The graduate students typically listed around five or six journals that were of secondary importance to them, and seven or eight that they read occasionally. They were much less likely than faculty to list other journals that they read that were not included on the lists of journals on the questionnaire (See Appendix I).

One interesting subgroup of graduate student responses was a coterie of military history students at Duke. Of the student respondents, they were by far the most interested in bibliography. They were the only ones among the students to list many journals in which they were interested that were not included on the questionnaire; they were also the only students to annotate the survey very extensively. They were evidently quite frustrated because Perkins Library at Duke did not have many of the journals that they considered quite important for their work, and were using this survey as a means of expressing some of this frustration.

Most of the graduate students said that they had recommended books for purchase by the library; eight said that they had not recommended any at all, and two added "not yet" to their answer. Only five of them said they used the bibliographies and lists for sources for finding new books to recommend for purchase. All except two said that they thought they would be useful sources for librarians, though (See Appendix I).

Even though faculty response was somewhat better than that by the students, it was still not sufficient to draw any firm conclusions. Most of the faculty respondents were full professors--13 out of 20. Only three assistant and three associate professors responded. (The survey was sent to roughly equal numbers of full, associate, and assistant professors.) The largest subject specialty was British history; the bulk of the others concentrated in French, German, Russian, and a variety of other areas-- Medieval, History of Science, and so

forth. They usually were responsible for four to five courses; the more senior professors had fewer courses, although it is difficult to pinpoint this exactly, since many of them listed upper-level seminars which would be offered only occasionally. Most read five or six journals regularly. Most listed two to three journals that were important to them in the "Others" category. All recommended books for purchase by the library; all used the bibliographies and lists of new books as sources for these recommendations. All thought such lists would be useful collection development tools for librarians (See Appendix I).

II. SURVEY OF LIBRARIANS

In addition to determining which journals were most useful to historical scholars for current awareness in their own fields, librarians involved in collection development and selection were surveyed to see whether they were aware of these lists of recent publications in journals, whether any of these were actually being used by them for collection development in the areas for which they were responsible, and what their general reaction to the use of such lists in general was. This information was then used to determine the level of importance that such bibliographies and lists of publications had for librarians involved in collection development.

To answer these questions, the librarians at Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, who had either full- or part-time responsibilities in collection development, were sent questionnaires in late February, 1985, to determine the ways in which they found out about new publications in their areas of responsibility, and what were their most important methods for finding out about these. They were asked to give an approximate percentage of time that they spent on different collection development activities, and to rank different methods of finding out about new publications (See Appendices II and III).

This survey also had been preceded by a pilot survey, in which three librarians at UNC-CH and two at Duke had been sent questionnaires with cover letters asking for suggestions for revisions or changes in the format or content. All of those sent the pilot questionnaire responded, and most made very helpful suggestions for changes. All expressed interest in the results of the study. One respondent suggested several journal articles in the area of collection analysis that would be useful. The major changes incorporated into the final version of the survey, resulting from the pilot survey, were 1) to ask

those surveyed to give percentages of time that they spent on different collection development activities, and 2) to rank according to usefulness the different current awareness services that they need.

Final questionnaires were sent to six collection development librarians at UNC-CH, of whom five responded, and 28 collection development librarians at Duke, from whom there were 21 responses. Overall, the response rate from librarians was much better than from historians. All the librarians surveyed at UNC-CH were full-time collection development librarians; only four of the respondents from Duke were full-time collection development librarians. The remainder spent from two to 20 hours per week on collection development, depending on the amount and level of their responsibilities in the particular subject area. Part-time collection development spent an average of 8.4 hours per week on collection development activities; full-time collection development librarians spent more than 40 hours per week (See Appendix III).

Of the time spent in different areas of collection development, full-time collection development librarians spent around an average of 5 percent of their time on faculty liaison work, the same percentage as part-time collection development librarians. Full-time librarians averaged spending around 10 percent of their time reading review articles and book lists to find out about new publications; part-time librarians spent around 40 percent of their time with this. Likewise, part-time librarians spent an average of 20 percent of their time reading books and articles in their assigned fields, whereas full-time librarians spent about 5 per cent of their time making formal recommendations for new purchases, the same average amount as full-time librarians. Both groups also spent around five percent of their time conducting collection analyses. Reviewing new periodical titles turned out to be almost exclusively the province of full-time collection development librarians--most

part-time collection development librarians did not list this as one of their activities, while full-time collection development librarians spent an average of 10 percent of their time on serials selection. The remainder of the time spent on collection development activities--60 percent for full-time collection development librarians, 25 percent for part-time--was scattered over a variety of other activities. For full-time librarians, the bulk of this was devoted to reviewing proof slips, vendor notification forms, and publishers' advertisements. Part time collection development librarians spent most of this other time reviewing advertisements from publishers and reading review journals like Choice or Library Journal. The two heads of collection development averaged over 50 percent of their time with administrative duties (See Appendix III).

The kinds of current awareness services used did not differ as much depending on whether the respondent had full-time collection development responsibilities or only part-time. What differences there were seemed to depend on what was customary in their particular library--for instance, none of the collection development librarians at UNC-CH considered bibliographies in standard texts to be very important, while the librarians at Duke ranked these very highly.

Thus, response to question 4 of the librarians' survey was as follows (See Appendix III):

a) Bibliographies of standard texts in the particular field.

Very important- 12	Somewhat important- 6
Occasionally important- 3	Do not use- 5

b) Reviews in Choice.

Very important- 10	Somewhat important- 5
Occasionally- 2	Do not use- 9

c) Reviews in Booklist.

Very important- 2 Somewhat important- 7

Occasionally important- 4 Do not use- 13

d) Reviews in Library Journal.

Very important- 1 Somewhat important- 10

Occasionally important- 3 Do not use- 12

e) Publication notices and announcements from publishers.

Very important- 12 Somewhat important- 8

Occasionally important- 6 Do not use- 0

f) Lists or bibliographies provided by faculty or graduate students.

Very important- 2 Somewhat important- 7

Occasionally important- 10 Do not use- 7

g) Reviews in general reviewing magazines like the Times Literary Supplement or the New York Times Book Review.

Very important- 2 Somewhat important- 8

Occasionally important- 13 Do not use- 3

h) Bibliographic essays in journals in the particular field.

Very important- 4 Somewhat important- 9

Occasionally important- 12 Do not use- 1

i) Book reviews in journals in the particular field.

Very important- 9 Somewhat important- 9

Occasionally important- 6 Do not use- 2

j) Lists of recent publications in journals in the particular field.

Very important- 7 Somewhat important- 9

Occasionally important- 8 Do not use- 2

k) Book dealers lists.

Very important- 12 Somewhat important- 4

Occasionally important- 6 Do not use- 4

l) CIP slips from the Library of Congress.

Very important- 9 Somewhat important- 4

Occasionally important- 2 Do not use- 11

Other current awareness services listed were: forms from vendors such as Blackwell-North America, LC proof slips, Out-of-print catalogs, and the new acquisitions lists of other libraries.

Most of the librarians surveyed did not specifically list one most important current awareness service, but simply said that all of those given had their uses, or listed more than one. For those who did list a most important source, journals were most important to 11 and advertisements from publishers to 5. Other "main sources" included CIP forms (2), LC proof slips (2), vendor forms (2), the Modern Language Association Bibliography (1), and LC Accessions Lists (See Appendix III).

All but two librarians said that they used lists of recent publications and bibliographies that appeared in journals for collection development (See Appendix III). All the librarians thought that such lists would be useful for collection development, given, as one added, "sufficient staff and time." Several others said that such lists were best used for retrospective collection development, or for adding titles in very narrow subject areas.

PART THREE

JOURNALS WITH LISTS OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES THAT WOULD BE USEFUL FOR LIBRARIANS

I. Introduction

The British and European history journals in the following list were mainly chosen on the basis of two qualities: 1) their importance to historians, and 2) the presence of lists of recently published books or book reviews as a regular feature. Another important criterion for inclusion was a fairly high annual circulation--only those journals that could be assumed to be available to a fairly wide pool of readers could be considered really important sources for finding out about new publications. Thus, journals with annual subscriptions of less than 800 (based on figures given in the 1983 Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory) were automatically excluded. Also, of course, journals that had ceased publication were excluded.

The journals' importance to historians was determined by responses to the pilot questionnaire on sources for current awareness about new publications, and by general knowledge of those historical journals that were considered most significant to scholars in the field. Then, those journals were examined to see the quality and quantity of lists of recent publications, book reviews, and regularly-appearing bibliographic essays that they contained. In one case, for the Journal of Modern History, the importance of the journal to scholars outweighed the quality of lists or reviews that it had; however, for the others, both importance to scholars and the quality of lists or reviews was weighted equally.

II. LIST OF JOURNALS

Albion

Call number: DA20.A4

V.1 (1969)- . Quarterly.

Survey score: 6- Primary importance, essential.

3- Secondary importance.

3- Occasional importance.

Published by the Department of History at Appalachian State University, Boone, N.C., and affiliated with the North American Conference on British Studies. Journal of the members of this organization; comes to them with membership, along with Journal of British Studies.

Subjects covered: British history and culture.

Reviews and booklists: 25-30 page-length, signed reviews; list of "Books Received" with about 20-25 citations. Gives reports and reviews of published conference proceedings, with brief abstracts of the papers which these contain.

American Historical Review

Call number: E171.A57

V.1 (1894)- . Five issues per year.

Survey score: 39- Primary importance, essential.

10- Secondary importance.

4- Occasional importance.

Published by the American Historical Association. Most prestigious historical journal published in the United States.

Subjects covered: Does not contain just American history, but that of all places and eras, although American and European history predominate.

Reviews and Booklists: many (30+) long, signed reviews. Organized geographically, by subject. Reviews of foreign language, foreign-authored books. Very useful section of "Collected Essays"--books of collections of essays by scholars on particular subjects. Also in this section, lists names of each contributor and the title of his article. Also, section on published document collections given, as well as new bibliographies--around 50 to 60 in each issue. Finally, has long (100+ citations) list of "Books Received." N.B. In spite of the prestige attached to articles published in the American Historical Review, its greatest service to historians, and what it is mainly used for by them, is these extensive lists of new books and publications. An AHR review can make or break a book's reputation among scholars.

Antiquaries Journal

Call Number: DA20.S612

V.1(1921) - . Two issues per year.

Survey score: 1- Primary importance; essential.

1- Secondary importance.

1- Occasional importance.

Published by Cambridge University Press. Similar to the English Historical Review, but more for scholars of ancient history and archeology.

Subjects covered: Ancient history and archeology, with the emphasis on non-classical archeology.

Reviews and booklists: Usually 70-100 short book reviews per issue, with two or three longer (one or more full pages) ones as well. Of use to librarians at universities with strong programs in medieval or ancient history.

Central European History

Call number: D961.C34

V.1 (1968)- . Quarterly.

Survey score: 5- Primary importance, essential.

6- Secondary importance.

6- Occasional importance.

Published by Emory University Press, and sponsored by the Conference Group for Central European History of the American Historical Association.

Subjects covered: Central European history

Reviews and Booklists: No reviews per se, but heavily annotated articles, which are used by scholars in this field. Also contains two or three review articles per year.

English Historical Review

Call Number: DA26. E58

V.1 (1886)- . Quarterly.

Survey score: 12- Primary importance, essential.

10- Secondary importance.

10- Occasional importance.

Published by Longmans, Green, and Co.

Subjects covered: English history and society.

Reviews and Booklists: Journal contains two or three long articles, and three or four short articles per issue, but the bulk of each issue (100+ pages) is devoted to 16-20 long reviews and 100-150 "Short Notices" of recent publications in the field of English history. Excellent sources for finding out about publications in this area. Contains foreign language materials--mostly French

language, but also some Dutch, German, and Spanish. Covers all the major English academic presses, as well as many small local or society presses.

French Historical Studies

Call number: 944.005.F877

V.1 (1958)- . Triannual.

Survey score: 2- Primary importance, essential.

8- Secondary importance.

9- Occasional importance.

Published by the Society for French Historical Studies of the American Historical Association.

Subjects covered: French history, society, and culture, from the Middle Ages to the present.

Reviews and booklists: 20-30 long signed reviews in each issue; however, chief value to historians, and, ultimately, to librarians, is in the long "List of Recent Publications" that appears at the end of each issue. This lists 500+ new books, published conference proceedings, reference works, and bibliographies. In each category, the works are grouped by the historical period covered. Many foreign language publications are listed, especially those from smaller university and regional presses in France. This list is unusual because it is compiled by a librarian, the social science bibliographer at Hampton-Sydney College in Virginia, who also is on the editorial board of the journal.

German Studies Review

Call number: DD1.G382

V.1 (1978)- . Triannual.

Survey score: 4- Primary importance, essential.

6- Secondary importance.

7- Occasional importance.

Published at Arizona State University, by the Western Association for German Studies.

Subjects covered: German language, culture, and history, written in both English and German.

Reviews and booklists: 40-50 reviews per issue, of varying lengths. The bulk of the journal is devoted to scholarly articles; however, there are many reviews, in English, of German language publications, both books and conference proceedings. There is no list of books received.

Historian

Call number: D1.H22

V.1 (1938) . Quarterly.

Survey score: 5- Primary importance, essential.

8- Secondary importance.

10- Occasional importance.

Published by Phi Alpha Theta, the International Honorary Society for History. Journal of the members of this organization; comes to them with membership.

Subjects covered: No subject limits; will publish articles by historians which are not members of the Society, although first preference is given to articles by members.

Reviews and booklists: 30-40 medium-length reviews per issue; no subject

limits, although, again, preference in selection is given to books written by Society members. An index to the journal is published every five years, which includes book reviews. No review articles or list of books received.

The Historical Journal

Call number: D1.H33

V.1 (1957)- . Monthly.

Survey score- 7- Primary importance, essential.

10- Secondary importance.

8- Occasional importance.

Published by Cambridge University Press.

Subjects covered: English history in general, with no chronological limits.

Reviews and booklists: one or two "Historiographical reviews" per issue; four or five review articles; 10-15 long (two or more pages) is very definite tendency to review books by scholars with Oxford or Cambridge connections; the very distinguished editorial committee, all of whom are from these two universities, may have something to do with this. Practically no books written by American scholars, and only a very few written by scholars from other universities are reviewed; the reviewers as well are almost entirely from Oxford or Cambridge. The reviews tend to be very long and resemble scholarly articles rather than book reviews.

International Review of Social History

Call number: HN1.I53

V.1 (1956)- . Triannual.

Survey scores: 5- Primary importance, essential.

9- Secondary importance.

8- Occasional importance.

Published and edited by the International Institute for Social History, Amsterdam.

Subjects covered: Social history, with a definite Marxist emphasis. No geographic or chronological limitations, although European history predominates.

Reviews and booklists: No book reviews or bibliographic essays; does list 40-50 recent publications with a short bibliographic description of each, and ordering information. There is also a list of the Institute's own publications. This is a very good source for socialist press publications, which can frequently be difficult to find. One interesting note about this journal--a recently deceased editor of the journal was referred to as a "convinced Communist" and thus "eminently qualified" to be its editor.

Journal of British Studies

Call number: DA26.J6

V.1 (1961)- . Quarterly.

Survey score: 5- Primary importance, essential.

9- Secondary importance.

3- Occasional importance.

Published by the North American Conference on British Studies. Journal of the members of this organization; comes to them with membership, along with Albion.

Subjects covered: British social and political history.

Reviews and booklists: No book reviews or lists of recent publications; does have very long, very complete bibliographic essays in each issue, though, which would be useful for respective collection development.

Journal of Contemporary History

Call number: D410.J66

V.1 (1966)- . Quarterly.

Survey score: 8- Primary importance, essential.

10- Secondary importance.

7- Occasional importance.

Published by Sage Publications, London.

Subjects covered: Recent European history, with an emphasis on Great Britain.

Reviews and Booklists: No regular book reviews or lists of books received; usually one or two review articles per issue, which concentrate on publications in areas of very current interest.

Journal of Ecclesiastical History

Call number: BR140.J6

V.1 (1950)- . Quarterly.

Survey score: 3- Primary importance, essential.

4- Secondary importance.

5- Occasional importance.

Published by Cambridge University Press.

Subjects covered: European church and religious history, with a heavy slant towards studies about the medieval English church. Reviews and booklists: Each issue contains one long review article, 17-20 long book reviews, 20-30 short

reviews, and a long (100+) list of recent publications, in order by publisher. Around 40 publishers are listed. Gives ordering information and price in local currency (i.e., in the country of publication). Each volume is indexed, but only the long book reviews and the review articles are included in this index. Very good for collection development where there are strong programs in medieval studies or English medieval history, since the coverage of recent publications in these areas is very good. Coverage is weaker for more recent church history, or American ecclesiastical history.

Journal of European Economic History

Call number: HC240.A1J8

V.1 (1972)- . Quarterly.

Survey score: 7- Primary importance, essential.

6- Secondary importance.

9- Occasional importance.

Published by the Banco di Roma, Rome.

Subjects covered: European economic history and current economic affairs in general. Some articles on American economic affairs. Reviews and Booklists: Two-three review articles per issue; eight-ten long reviews; long (100+) list of Books Received. About half the books listed are English language; the rest are other major Western European languages. Most are concerned with the economic history of the last 30 years. The majority have as their main interest economic affairs in Western Europe; however, the ones on more recent subjects cover the United States and the Third World as well. A good list for a retrospective collection analysis project, but since most are from major presses or by major authors, less useful for current collection development.

Journal of Interdisciplinary History

Call number: D1.J57

V.1 (1969)- . Quarterly.

Survey score: 5- Primary importance, essential.

17-Secondary importance.

7- Occasional importance.

Published by M.I.T. Press.

Subjects covered: Interdisciplinary history, with an emphasis on recent issues and trends, i.e. "The Microcomputer Revolution for Historians."

Reviews and booklists: One or two review articles per issue, and around 20 long reviews. No list of books received. Almost all written by American academics; all English language.

Journal of Modern History

Call number: D1.J6

V.55 (1927)- . Quarterly.

Survey score: 22- Primary importance, essential.

14- Secondary importance.

7- Occasional importance.

Published by the University of Chicago Press, in conjunction with the Modern European History Section of the American Historical Association.

Subjects covered: Nineteenth and twentieth century history, with an emphasis on England and America.

Reviews and booklists: one or two review articles and 40-50 medium-length signed reviews per issue. Mainly American and English subjects and authors; very few German, even fewer French.

Journal of Social History

Call number: H1.J67

V.1 (1967)- . Quarterly.

Survey score: 11- Primary importance, essential.

15- Secondary importance.

7- Occasional importance.

Published and edited by the History department at Carnegie-Mellon University.

Subjects covered: Social history in general; definite "socialist" tenor in articles, although few of the contributors are actually Marxist historians.

Reviews and Booklists: 20-30 long, signed reviews per issue. Usually English-language publications from major university presses.

Victorian Studies

Call number: PR1.V5

V.1 (1957)- . Quarterly.

Survey score: 8- Primary importance, essential.

7- Secondary importance.

4- Occasional importance.

Edited by the Victorian Literature Group of the Modern Language Association, and published by Indiana University Press.

Subjects covered: Victorian culture and society.

Reviews and Booklists: 20-30 long, signed reviews per issue. Many of the books reviewed cover literary topics (around 60%); the remainder cover subjects that could be loosely defined as history or sociology. Almost all are English Language and from major university or academic presses.

Slavic Review

Call number: D377.A1A5

V.1 (1941)- . Quarterly.

Survey score: 5- Primary importance, essential.

2- Secondary importance.

1- Occasional importance.

Published by the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies.

Subjects covered: Soviet and Eastern European history, society, and culture.

Most important journal for scholars in these areas.

Reviews and Booklists: One or two review articles per issue; 50-60 long reviews, and list of Books Received with 100-150 citations. Many publishers are listed, as well as books in many languages, although English and Russian predominate. There is a separate list of reprints and new editions. There is good bibliographic information for each citation, as well as ordering information. One particularly useful feature is a list of recently published symposium proceedings. Titles and authors of all the papers in each volume are given.

Social History/Histoire Sociale

Call number: HN1.S56

V.1 (1968)- . Biannual.

Survey Score: 5- Primary importance, essential.

11- Secondary importance.

14- Occasional importance.

Published by the University of Ottawa and the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Subjects covered: Social history, in general.

Reviews and Booklists: 23-30 long reviews per issue. No real geographic or chronological emphasis in the choice of books reviewed, but most are by Canadian authors. Minimal usefulness to librarians.

NOTES

[1] Quoted, Paul H. Mosher, "Collection Development to Collection Management: Toward Stewardship of Library Resources," Collection Management 4 (December 1982) p. 41.

[2] Quoted, Ibid., p. 42.

[3] Ibid., p. 44.

[4] American Library Association, Report of the National Enquiry on Scholarly Communication. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1979).

[5] Paul Mosher, "Collection Development to Collection Management: Toward Stewardship of Library Resources," p. 45.

[6] Margaret Stieg, "The Information Needs of Historians," College and Research Libraries 42 (October 1981) p. 550.

[7] Bath University Library, "Investigation into Information Requirements of the Social Sciences." (Research Report 1: Information Requirements of Researchers in the Social Sciences). June, 1971.

[8] Cynthia Corkill and Margaret Mann, "Information Needs in the Humanities: Two Postal Surveys." (Occasional Papers 2: British Library Research and Development Department Report No. 5455). University of Sheffield: Centre for Research on Users Studies, 1978.

[9] Bath University Library, "Investigation into Information Requirements of the Social Sciences." p. 75.

[10] Cynthia Corkill and Margaret Mann, "Information Needs in the Humanities: Two Postal Surveys." p. 84.

[11] Dagmar Horne Perman ed. Bibliography and the Historian: the Conference at Belmont of the Joint Committee on Bibliographical Services to History, May 1967. (Santa Barbara, CA; Washington, D.C.: Clio, 1968).

[12] Patricia Stentron and Ruth McBride, "Serial Use by Social Science

Faculty: a Survey," College and Research Libraries 40 (October 1979): 426-31.

[13] Mary McPherson, "Historiography: Its Implications for Building Library Collections," Canadian Library Journal 33, (February 1976): p. 43.

[14] Robert N. Broadus, "The Literature of the Social Sciences: a Survey of Citation Studies," International Social Science Journal 23 (June 1972): 236-43; Lois Bebout, Donald Davis, and Donald Oehlerts, "User Studies in the Humanities: a Survey and Proposal," RQ 15 (January 1975): 40-44.

[15] Arthur Monroe McAnally, "Characteristics of the Materials Used in Research in United States History." (Ph.d. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1951.)

[16] Clyve Jones, Michael Chapman, and Pamela Carr Woods, "The Characteristics of the Literature Used by Historians," Journal of Librarianship 4 (February 1972): 137-56.

[17] Arthur Monroe McAnally, "Characteristics of the Materials Used in Research in United States History." p. 4.

[18] Ibid., p. 5.

[19] Ibid., p. 135.

[20] Clyve Jones, Michael Chapman, and Pamela Carr Woods, "The Characteristics of the Literature Used by Historians." p. 140.

[21] Robert P. Coale, "Evaluation of a Research Library Collection." Library Quarterly 35 (January 1965): 173-84.

[22] Douglas Waples and Harold Lasswell, National Libraries and Foreign Scholarship: Notes on Recent Selections in the Social Sciences. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1936).

[23] Margaret Stieg, "The Information Needs of Historians."

[24] Ibid., p. 566.

APPENDIX I

SAMPLE OF SURVEY FORM SENT TO HISTORIANS

PROCESSES ON COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

Year in which Bachelor's degree was granted_____

Institution where you teach or go to school_____

Professional Rank_____

If a graduate student, what is your projected terminal degree, and when do you hope to receive it?_____

Area of Specialization_____

Courses taught_____
_____

Please rank the following journals in their order of importance for your own current awareness of recent publications in your field. 1-Primary importance, essential; 2-Secondary importance; 3-Occasional importance; 0-Do not read.

__American Historical Review
__English Historical Review
__The Historical Journal
__International Review of Social History
__Journal of Modern History
__Journal of Contemporary History
__Journal of Interdisciplinary History
__Slavic Review
__Albion
__Central European History
__Contemporary French Civilization
__French Historical Studies
__German Studies Review
__Journal of European Economic History
__Journal of British Studies
__Victorian Studies
__Journal of Ecclesiastical History
__Journal of Social History
__Social History
__Historian
__Antiquaries Journal
Others? (English language only-please list)_____
_____

Do you ever recommend new books for purchase by the library? Yes__ No__

Do you use the bibliographies and lists of recent publications in these journals as sources for recommending new books to be bought by the library at your institution? Yes__ No__

Do you think that they would be useful guides for librarians to use when making decisions about new acquisitions? Yes__ No__

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

Appendix II

SAMPLE OF LETTER WHICH ACCOMPANIED SURVEY FORMS

School of Library Science
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514
February 22, 1985

Davis Library
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

Dear Survey Recipient:

The enclosed survey is part of a research project being conducted to fulfill the requirements for a Master of Science in Library Science. It would be gratefully appreciated if you would fill out this form and return it to me in the enclosed envelope by March 18, 1985.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Sallie H. Barringer

APPENDIX III

SAMPLE OF SURVEY FORM SENT TO LIBRARIANS

PROCESSES IN COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

Institution_____
Years at your current position_____

1. Are you a full-time collection development Librarian?___Yes___No

2. How many hours per week do you spend on collection development?
_____

3. Which of the following do you do in your collection development work? Please give an approximate percentage of the amount of time spent on each.
____ Faculty liaison work with certain departments to get new book requests and learn about new areas of research.
____ Reading review articles and book lists to determine new books to purchase.
____ Reading new books and journal articles in your assigned field(s) to keep abreast of new developments.
____ Making formal recommendations for purchases by your library.
____ Conducting collection analyses and surveys to determine strengths and weaknesses of your library's collection.
____ Reviewing new periodical titles to decide whether or not to add them to the collection.
Others? _____
_____

4. What kinds of current awareness services or lists of recent publications do you use for making collection development decisions? Please rank according to importance: 1-Very important; 2-Somewhat important; 3-Occasionally important; 0-Do not use.

___Bibliographies in standard texts for the particular field.
___Reviews in Choice.
___Reviews in Booklist.
___Reviews in Library Journal.
___Publication notices and announcements from publishers.
___Lists or bibliographies provided by faculty or graduate students.
___Reviews in general reviewing magazines like the Times Literary Supplement or the New York Times Book Review.
___Bibliographic essays in journals in the particular field.
___Book reviews in journals in the particular field.
___Lists of recent publications in journals in the particular field.
___Book dealers lists.
___CIP slips from the Library of Congress.
Others?_____

5. What is your main source for finding out about new publications in your field(s) of responsibility?_____

6. Do you use any lists of bibliographies of recent publications that appear in journals of serials for collection development decisions? Yes___ No___

7. Do you think that given the time and availability to use them, such bibliographies could be useful for collection development librarians? Yes___No___

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!